DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 686 JC 800 349

TITLE Reference Manual: Integrating and Implementing Policy Decisions.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Board of Governors.
PUB DATE Jan 80
NOTE 56p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; *Community Colleges; Compliance (Legal); Educational Objectives; *Educational Planning; Governance; State Boards of Education; State Legislation; *State Standards; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

At its December 1979 meeting, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges unanimously adopted a resolution initiating a process to integrate and implement several of its major policies. Specifically, the Board committed itself to: (1) establish measurable statewide objectives for community colleges; (2) review and redefine its existing minimum standards; (3) seek repeal or modification of Education Code provisions which unnecessarily restrict the use of district resources; (4) establish a process for the submission, review, and approval of district comprehensive plans; and (5) establish a process for determining compliance with minimum standards and for enforcing them. This reference manual includes the text of the December agenda item and the Board's subsequent action on the item. It also identifies the various policies that are intended to be integrated and implemented through the actions listed above. It contains Board policies on philosophy and goals; on accountability; on agency objectives and assignment of priorities to mandated functions; and on establishing minimum standards which have previously been adopted by the Board. The report includes a proposed implementation timetable and describes a model for the development of guidelines and standards in several governance areas. (Author/JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188686

REFERENCE MANUAL:

INTEGRATING AND IMPLEMENTING POLICY DECISIONS.

Board of Governors

California Community Colleges

January 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gerald Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 800 349

PREFACE

At its December, 1979 meeting, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges unanimously adopted a resolution initiating a process to integrate and implement several of its major policies. Specifically, the Board committed itself to:

1. *Establish measurable "statewide objectives" for community colleges;*

2. *Review and redefine its existing "minimum standards;"*

3. *Seek repeal or modification of Education Code provisions which unnecessarily restrict the use of district resources;*

4. *Establish a process for the submission, review, and approval of district comprehensive plans; and*

5. *Establish a process for determining compliance with and enforcing minimum standards.*

This reference manual includes the text of the December agenda item and the Board's subsequent action on the item. It also identifies the various policies that are intended to be integrated and implemented through the actions listed above. Specifically, it contains Board policy on philosophy and goals; policy on accountability, which was adopted as part of the Long-Term Finance Plan; policy on agency objectives and assignment of priorities to mandated functions, which was adopted as part of the proposed 1980-81 agency budget; and policy (regulation) establishing minimum standards which have previously been adopted by the Board.

REFERENCE MANUAL:

INTEGRATING AND IMPLEMENTING
POLICY DECISIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Board of Governors Agenda Item on Integrating and Implementing Policy Decisions and Subsequent Board Action	1
II.	Statement of Philosophy and Goals (Adopted January, 1976) .	18
III.	Policy on Philosophy, Goals and Priorities from the Long-Term Finance Plan (Adopted February, 1979)	20
IV.	Policy on Accountability from the Long-Term Finance Plan (Adopted April, 1979)	25
V.	Agency Objectives and Assignment of Priorities to Functions (Adopted July, 1979)	34
VI.	Education Code Provisions Related to Minimum Standards and Master Planning	50
VII.	Title 5 Provisions Related to Minimum Standards	52

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
December 6-7, 1979

Title: Integrating and Implementing Policy Decisions

Staff presentation: Dr. Glenn G. Gooder, Interim Chancellor
Thomas J. Nussbaum, General Counsel

Summary

This item is the second in a series of items aimed at improving the governance of the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office. It is in specific response to a discussion item entitled "Integrating Recent Policy Decisions," which was before the Board in October.

This four part item:

1. Provides more specific information on the nature, scope and intent of the steps which staff is proposing;

2. Suggests a timetable and process for carrying out those steps;

3. Summarizes discussion of the Education Policy Committee; and

4. Lists alternative courses of action for carrying out all or a portion of what has been proposed.

Recommended Action

It is recommended that the Board discuss the item, provide input for further staff work regarding clarification or modification, and adopt one of the courses of action described on page 10.

At its October meeting, the Board discussed an information item entitled "Integrating Recent Policy Decisions." The item generally discussed the need to deal in some reasonable manner with all the mandates the Board and Chancellor's Office have been charged with carrying out, and specifically addressed the need to interrelate the policies and regulations the Board has adopted to meet these mandates. A sequence of steps was suggested by staff, and several preliminary policy issues were discussed.

After the item had been discussed, staff stated that it would incorporate Board comments into a December agenda item, which would provide additional specificity as to the scope of the item and propose a specific timetable and process for action.

This item:

I. Provides more specific information on the nature, scope and intent of the steps which staff is proposing, especially with respect to the concept of three levels of governance (statewide objectives, guidelines and minimum standards);

II. Suggests a timetable and process for carrying out the purposes of the item;

III. Summarizes discussion of the Education Policy Committee; and

IV. Lists alternative courses of action for carrying out all or a portion of what has been proposed.

I. SPECIFICS ON THE NATURE, SCOPE, AND INTENT OF THE PROPOSAL

A. Problem Areas Contributing to Ineffective Governance

The proposal under discussion attempts to address several problem areas which have all contributed, in one manner or another, to reduce the effectiveness of the Board and Chancellor's Office (hereinafter referred to as the "agency") in addressing not only their own concerns, but also the concerns of the Legislature, other state agencies and local districts. Those problem areas are, in brief:

1. The agency has insufficient staff to carry out its mandates -- During the past few years, staffing for the agency (which has never been adequate) has been steadily reduced, while the mandates placed upon it have steadily increased. Some of the mandates are impractical, overburdensome or outdated. Others, importantly, have been specifically placed upon the agency or the field because of a failure to be responsive to statewide concerns (e.g. the Chancellor's responsibility under Education Code Section 71095 to "monitor and review" courses and programs was imposed because of a failure to adequately comply with or enforce course and program approval statutes).

2. Regulatory and compliance functions have tended to preoccupy the agency -- Of the some 600 Education Code mandates addressed to the agency, all but about 10 have to do with what could be characterized as regulatory or compliance functions. The handful of mandates that have to do with leadership or service functions are broad, general, and, all too often, vague. The mandates dealing with regulatory and compliance functions tend to be highly specific.

   Historically, the agency has tended to become swept up in "putting out brush fires" relating to regulatory or compliance functions, and has had little opportunity to fulfill (or even plan to fulfill) its rather general leadership and service functions. With so little opportunity to be forward-looking, this problem has tended to perpetuate itself.

3. Units within the Chancellor's Office have tended to work in isolation -- This fact has resulted in overburdensome reporting requirements, ineffectual compliance procedures, and mixed state directives. With respect to reporting, each unit has tended to devise its own reporting requirements, with its own deadlines. The result, in some instances, has been duplicate reporting. With respect to compliance, each unit has tended to adopt its own compliance processes. The result has been the development or existence of at least 15 compliance procedures (see Appendix A, pages 11-12), few of which are effectively carried out.

   Finally, in areas where more than one unit of the Chancellor's Office is involved, districts have sometimes received mixed signals as to what the requirements of law are. The result, in those instances, has been confusion and frustration.

4. Board policies have tended to be adopted in isolation of one another, with little emphasis on interrelation, review or implementation -- The adoption of almost every Board policy involves a commitment of resources if there is to be implementation. The limited resources available are wasted where adopted policies are in conflict with one another, or where they have not been interrelated so as to efficiently achieve their mutual ends.

The interplay of these problem areas has, over time, had the effect of creating uncertainty as to the roles and responsibilities of the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office, as well as the roles and responsibilities of local district boards of trustees. This uncertainty as to roles and responsibilities has in turn contributed to a "governance vacuum," especially with respect to decision-making and policy setting from within the community college system. All too often, Chancellor's Office staff and local constituencies in the districts and colleges work

at cross purposes, rather than as a cohesive unit with shared responsibility.

Because the Board and Chancellor's Office have at times been relatively ineffectual at addressing not only their own concerns, but also the concerns of the Legislature, other state agencies, and local districts, many of the policy decisions which should have and could have been made from within the community college system have been made by the Legislature and other state agencies. Given the shift to 80% state funding which has occurred during the past two years, the tolerance to this governance vacuum will most probably lessen. At the very least, there is bound to be increased scrutiny of the governance mechanisms existing within the system, as well as increased scrutiny as to how districts are accountable to the state for its investment.

In order to preserve local policy making and avoid the further intrusion of the Legislature and other state agencies into areas of policy that should be decided from within the system, the system must demonstrate that it can provide effective governance, establish its own policies, and be accountable for legitimate state interests. Failure to make these kinds of demonstrations, and, more indicting, the failure to acknowledge and attempt to address the governance vacuum, will inevitably result in some form of budget review or greater control and oversight of the system by the Legislature.

B. Steps Taken and Steps Remaining to Improve Governance

Under Chancellor Craig's leadership, the Board and Chancellor's Office took some important steps to improve statewide governance and to make more coherent the role of the agency. An initial streamlining of agency functions has been enacted into law; agency objectives have been identified, with an emphasis on leadership and service; agency functions have categorized as "first" or "second" priority; and an initial step towards consolidation of reporting and compliance responsibilities has been taken with the adoption of the accountability portion of the Long-Term Finance Plan.

With this item, staff is proposing that the following additional steps need to be taken:

1. Measurable statewide objectives need to be established;

2. Existing minimum standards (regulations) for the receipt of state aid need to be reviewed and redefined;

3. Existing Education Code provisions which unnecessarily restrict the use of district resources need to be reviewed, and legislation introduced;

4. A process for the submission, review, and approval of district comprehensive plans needs to be established; and

5. A process for determining compliance with and enforcing minimum standards needs to be established.

By implementing the Board's policy on the accountability portion of the Long-Term Finance Plan (that is, by adopting statewide objectives and a process for review of comprehensive plans) it will be possible to consolidate various reporting and/or approval requirements imposed by the agency, and thereby bring the units into more of a working relationship with one another. By reviewing and redefining minimum standards, it will be possible to consolidate and clarify the compliance functions of the agency. Finally, by reviewing the Education Code with the intent to seek repeal or modification of unnecessary restrictions, it will be possible to devote more time to performing the leadership and service functions of the agency. The Board, in taking these steps, will thereby have the opportunity to review, interrelate and implement many of the policies it has adopted since its inception.

More importantly, by taking the steps listed above, the agency, working together with the districts, will demonstrate that it is attempting to provide effective governance, establish its own policies and be accountable to the state. By taking these steps, the planning and compliance functions of the agency will not only have viability, but credibility. The result, hopefully, will be less Legislative intervention, and less control by other state agencies.

C. Governance on Three Levels: Statewide Objectives, Guidelines, and Minimum Standards

At the heart of the steps proposed to improve statewide governance is the concept of agency governance on three levels within a given subject matter area: statewide objectives, guidelines, and minimum standards. Two of these three levels of governance (statewide objectives and guidelines) emphasize the leadership and service aspect of the agency's role, while minimum standards focus on the compliance role.

Statewide objectives represent strategies or expected results which are designed to address statewide goals established by the Board. Statewide objectives would be aspirational in nature, as they would establish strategies or expected results that no districts (or perhaps only a few districts) might have achieved. Statewide objectives would also be measurable, so that progress on achieving them might be evaluated.

Statewide objectives would be dealt with primarily through the mechanism of the comprehensive plan. Each year (or review cycle) a district would report on its strategies or plans for achieving the statewide objectives, including a report on why, if any, certain objectives weren't being incorporated. Each district would also evaluate its past performance on achieving statewide objectives which had been identified the prior year. Finally, districts would relate statewide objectives to district objectives. As such, statewide objectives would not be mandatory in nature; rather, the only mandate would be that districts demonstrate in their planning process how they are addressing them, or what particular reasons justify their not addressing them. Failure to meet a statewide objective would not result in a loss of state funds; rather the unjustified failure to attempt to meet a statewide objective would result in the district's loss of entitlement to apply for additional "program improvement" funds through the Board of Governors' Budget.

The second level of governance would be the "guideline," which would constitute a suggested or encouraged standard, procedure, or activity. Guidelines would be more specific than statewide objectives, and again would not be mandatory in nature. Rather, they would constitute procedures, standards or activities that the Board, under its leadership and service role, would urge the districts to adopt or pursue. Guidelines would thereby assist districts in meeting statewide objectives or other identified statewide concerns.

The third level of governance is the minimum standard. Minimum standards represent base levels of performance or functioning which districts must comply with in order to receive state aid. Minimum standards are, therefore, mandatory in nature. The minimum standards would be drawn to require compliance with those aspects within a given subject matter area which the Board believes all districts should comply with.

Thus, for a given subject matter area there could be statewide objectives, guidelines, and minimum standards. Compliance with minimum standards would be mandatory, while compliance with guidelines and statewide objectives would be encouraged. With respect to enforcing the base levels of performance or functioning established by minimum standards, the agency would be performing a compliance function; while with respect to encouraging the adoption of guidelines and the meeting of statewide objectives, the Board would be exercising its leadership and service function.

As an example of how statewide objectives, guidelines, and minimum standards could be developed for given subject matter areas, please refer to the model set forth in Appendix B, pages 13-16. This model is for discussion purposes only, and should not be construed as a staff proposal. It simply serves to illustrate the three levels of governance that can be constructed for a given subject matter area.

The model set forth in Appendix B was constructed by referring to the Board's Philosophy and Goals Statement; the Philosophy, Goals and Priorities portion of the Long-Term Finance Plan; the Accountability portion of the Long-Term Finance Plan; current Title 5 regulations designated as minimum standards; and relevant Education Code provisions having to do with the establishment of minimum standards. All of these policies, regulations and statutes will be compiled in a document entitled "Reference Manual: Integrating and Implementing Policy Decisions" which will be made available to Board members and interested parties.

Finally, it should be noted that the model in Appendix B has an additional heading entitled "Agency Objectives and Activities," for each subject matter area. Agency objectives and activities represent those purposes or activities that the Board and Chancellor's Office intend to direct their resource toward; that is, the agency's agenda for dealing with identified areas of concern, especially statewide objectives.

II. PROPOSED TIMETABLE AND PROCESS

Staff proposes that the following timetable and process be adopted for carrying out the purposes of this item. The steps that need to be taken, because of their importance and scope, should not, and probably cannot, be carried out any faster than proposed. It may, however, be necessary to lengthen the timetable in order to assure a quality product and a full opportunity for input.

1. December 1979: The Board should endorse the concept of the item by adopting a timetable and process for carrying out its purposes. The Board should also discuss the model for governance and provide input for further staff work regarding clarification or development of the process.

2. January or February 1980: The Board should discuss statewide objectives.

   Staff will prepare a preliminary draft of statewide objectives, soliciting the field as to what it believes should be statewide objectives, and by referring to Board policy on philosophy and goals, Board policy on long-term finance, Board policy on agency objectives, and the results of the recently completed needs assessment. The statewide objectives shall be drafted so as to be aspirational in nature, but measurable.

   Staff's preliminary draft of statewide objectives will be made available to the field, as well as other interested parties, including concerned state agencies. After input, the draft shall be revised, as appropriate, and presented to the Board. The Board should receive testimony, discuss the draft, and provide input for further staff work.

3. February or April 1980: The Board should discuss minimum standards and guidelines and make initial decisions about Education Code modifications.

Staff will prepare a preliminary draft of a comprehensive set of minimum standards, noting which standards have been proposed as currently contained in Title 5, which standards have been modified or deleted, and which standards have been added. Minimum standards shall be drafted so as to establish specific minimum levels of performance or functioning which districts must comply with in order to receive state aid.

Staff will also prepare a preliminary draft of an initial set of guidelines, which shall set forth recommended activities, standards or procedures for meeting statewide objectives. The guidelines will not be mandatory in nature; but, rather, will constitute suggested or encouraged activities, standards or procedures.

Staff will also prepare a list of Education Code modifications, which should be considered in implementing the intent of the overall undertaking. Subjects for modification include statutes which appear to unduly restrict the use of resources by district, statutes which are outdated or inappropriately applicable to community colleges, statutes dealing with the withholding of apportionments, and statutes which need to be modified or repealed in light of policies adopted in the Long-Term Finance Plan.

The staff documents on minimum standards, guidelines, and Education Code modifications will be made available to the field, as well as other interested parties, including concerned state agencies. After input, the drafts shall be revised, as appropriate, and presented to the Board.

With respect to minimum standards and guidelines, the Board should receive testimony, discuss the drafts, and direct further staff work. With respect to Education Code modifications, the Board should make initial decisions as to which sections should be modified or deleted. Some Board action in this respect is necessary in February in order to meet legislative deadlines. Once a bill is introduced, additional modifications can be incorporated into it as it moves through the Legislature.

4. April or June 1980: The Board should formally adopt Title 5 regulations on statewide objectives, guidelines, and minimum standards. The Board should also consider additional Education Code modifications that need to be made to carry out its policies.

5. June 1980: The Board should discuss the process for the development, submission and review of comprehensive plans; and the Board should also discuss agency objectives and activities for the 1980-81 and 1981-82 fiscal years.

Staff will prepare a preliminary draft of regulations covering the comprehensive plan process (which will implement the accountability portion of the Long-Term Finance Plan). This draft will be made available to the field and other interested parties. After input, the draft will be revised, as appropriate, and presented to the Board. The Board should receive testimony, discuss the draft, and provide input for further staff work.

In connection with the development of the agency budget, staff will also prepare a draft of agency objectives and activities for the 1980-81 and 1981-82 fiscal years, as well as an assignment of priorities for Board and Chancellor's Office functions. The draft will include a discussion of the progress made on agency objectives adopted in July of 1979. The Board should discuss the draft and provide input for further staff work.

6. July 1980: The Board should formally adopt Title 5 regulations on a process for the development, submission and review of comprehensive plans. The Board should also, in connection with its 1981-82 budget, adopt agency objectives and activities for 1980-81 and 1981-82, as well as an assignment of priorities to its various functions.

7. September 1980: The Board should discuss a process for determining compliance with and enforcing minimum standards.

   Staff will prepare a preliminary draft of regulations addressing such issues as how compliance with minimum standards would be investigated, the process for consulting with districts and making determinations of compliance or noncompliance, the process for district responses to findings of noncompliance, procedures for withholding of apportionments, and procedures for appeal.

   The draft of regulations will be made available to the field and other interested parties. After input, it will be revised, as appropriate, and presented to the Board. The Board should receive testimony, discuss the draft, and provide input for further staff work.

8. October 1980: The Board should formally adopt Title 5 regulations on a process for determining compliance with and enforcing minimum standards.

9. December 1980 (and each December thereafter): The Board should do the following:

   a. Review (and revise, if necessary) statewide objectives, guidelines and minimum standards.

   b. Adopt the legislative plan for the coming calendar year.

   c. Adopt or affirm specific delegations of authority to the Chancellor or others.

   d. Adopt regulations on Title 5 cleanup to account for recently enacted legislation.

III. SUMMARY OF EDUCATION POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

On November 16th the Education Policy Committee considered this item. Discussion was wide-ranging. While the committee did not take formal action with respect to the staff recommendation (to adopt the timetable), there appeared to be consensus on the following matters:

1. There was general endorsement of the concept of the item.

2. The timetable suggested by staff may be too ambitious; it should be an "aspirational" rather than an absolute timetable.

3. The importance of this undertaking merited some sort of special advisory committee or task force to insure structured field input in the development of the proposal. There was not complete agreement as to what the role of this group should be, to whom it should report, or who should designate its membership. On one hand (staff proposal), it was suggested that the group be advisory to (and selected by) the Chancellor, but whose views would be known to the Board and to the field. On the other hand, it was suggested that a relatively autonomous advisory group be convened. This group would review the issue of statewide governance as well as the agenda item, and recommend its own procedure for addressing the issue, if it perceived that something needed to be done.

4. The Chancellor was to identify and clarify alternative courses of action for pursuing all or a part of this item, especially with respect to the alternative roles and functions of an advisory group or task force.

IV. ALTERNATIVE COURSES OF ACTION

1. Endorse the concept of the proposal and direct staff to bring the elements (steps) to the Board in as timely a manner as possible, using the suggested timetable and process as a guide. The Chancellor shall convene a special committee which shall be advisory to the Chancellor, and which will play an integral part in the development and evaluation of the proposal.

   This is the staff recommendation.

2. Direct staff to convene an advisory group to review the issues and problems of statewide governance, and have the advisory group recommend a procedure or steps for clarifying and improving statewide governance.

3. Focus only on establishing statewide objectives and the comprehensive plan process. Do not review and revise minimum standards or develop a process for determining compliance with and enforcing them. Also, do not seek Education Code revisions until a later time.

4. Do not address this item as a series of steps; rather, attack it as a piece. Use already-adopted Board policy (its philosophy and goals) to establish the initial set of statewide objectives. Use current minimum standards. Focus attention on developing the comprehensive plan process and the minimum standards process.

APPENDIX A

SEPARATE COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES ALREADY IN USE OR AVAILABLE FOR USE

1. Minimum Standards: The Board is required to adopt minimum standards for receipt of state aid, and to periodically investigate for compliance (Education Code Sections 71025, 71026, 71066, 71068, and 74100).

2. Monitor and Review: The Chancellor's Office must periodically monitor and review approved courses and programs for compliance with applicable laws and regulations (Education Code Section 71095).

3. Course and Program Review and Approval: The Board must review and approve all educational programs and all courses not a part of an approved program (Education Code Sections 78200 and 78401).

4. Facilities Review and Approval: Any capital outlay project for which a district is requesting state funds must be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor's Office, and any construction costing more than $20,000 must be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor's Office (Education Code Sections 81800-81845).

5. Local Fiscal Audits of Districts: Each district must undergo an annual fiscal audit by a certified public accountant. Chancellor's Office and Department of Finance resolve audit problems (Education Code Sections 84040-84040.6).

6. State Fiscal Audits of Districts: Each year the Department of Finance performs a fiscal audit on selected community college districts. The Chancellor's Office resolves audit problems and withholds funds (Education Code Sections 84040-84040.6).

7. District Organization: All district organization, reorganization, or annexation proposals must be reviewed and approved by the Board of Governors (Education Code Section 74000).

8. EOPS: The Board must review and approve extended opportunity programs and extended opportunity services offered by districts. The Chancellor's Office reviews and approves district budgets for addressing their approved programs and services, and certifies state funds for such purposes (Education Code Sections 69648-69654; Title 5, Sections 56200-56296).

9. Handicapped Programs and Services (AB 77): The Board reviews district plans for the provision of programs and services to handicapped students, reviews budgets relating to the cost of such programs and services, and certifies state funds to provide for the direct excess costs of maintaining such services and programs. (Education Code Sections 78014 and 84850; Title 5, Sections 56000-56088).

10. Affirmative Action: Districts must adopt affirmative action policies and affirmative action plans, and submit an affirmation of compliance to the Chancellor. Title 5 regulations on affirmative action have been designated as minimum standards (Education Code Sections 87101-87106; Title 5, Sections 53000-53004).

11. Fifty Percent Law: The Board is required to enforce the requirement that districts must spend 50 percent of their current expense of education on the salaries of classroom instructors. Districts, to be exempted, need the approval of the Board (Education Code Section 84362; Title 5, Sections 59200-59206).

12. Vocational Education Audits: The Chancellor's Office periodically audits districts receiving federal funds for compliance with provisions of the Vocational Education Act (and regulations adopted pursuant to the Act).

13. Vocational Education Contracts with Proprietary Schools: The Chancellor's Office is required to review and approve district contracts with proprietary schools which provide vocational training. The Chancellor's Office has the authority to audit any such contract (Education Code Section 8092; Title 5, Sections 55600-55631).

14. RAVECs: Regional Adult and Vocational Education Councils, among other functions, review various kindergarten through grade twelve and community college course offerings for unnecessary duplication and make recommendations on apportionment to the Chancellor or Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Chancellor makes the final determination relative to withholding apportionment and approval of offerings (Education Code Sections 8020-8035; Title 5, Sections 11610-11631).

15. Comprehensive Plans: Board policy calls for it to establish statewide objectives, and requires that districts annually file a comprehensive plan or update. The Education Code currently requires the Board to review and approve academic master plans and master plans for facilities for each community college district (Education Code Section 71028; Title 5, Sections 55400-55405).

APPENDIX B

MODEL FOR DISCUSSION

STATEWIDE OBJECTIVES, GUIDELINES AND
MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR SPECIFIED
SUBJECT MATTER AREAS

I. ACCESS

A. Statewide Objectives:

1. Expand efforts to promote equal opportunity for access, irrespective of age, sex, race, physical condition, geographical location, etc. Improve the access ratios for those segments of the community which are underrepresented.

B. Guidelines:

1. Participate in EOPS.
2. Participate in handicapped programs and services (AB 77).
3. Initiate and carry on bilingual/bicultural programs.

C. Minimum Standards:

1. Adoption of a student affirmative action policy and plan, and filing current copies with the Chancellor's Office.

Agency Objectives and Activities:

1. Create staff position for bilingual specialist.
2. Seek full funding for EOPS.
3. Rework handicapped funding formula; initiate legislation.

II. DISTRICT PERSONNEL

A. Statewide Objectives:

1. Staff excellence on all levels (faculty, classified, administrative).
2. Improve ratios of minorities and women, and otherwise meet goals of affirmative action.

B. Guidelines:

1. Offer inservice training.
2. Implement collective bargaining.

C. Minimum Standards:

1. Adopt an affirmative action policy and plan; report to Chancellor.
2. Certification of compliance with credential regulations.

Agency Objectives and Activities:

1. Encourage improved instructor training through Fund for Instructional Improvement.

III. STUDENTS

A. Statewide Objectives:

1. Improve student retention.
2. Improve student preparation for entry into chosen field.
3. Improve counseling, career guidance, and job placement.

B. Guidelines:

1. Initiate, carry on and improve student financial aid programs.
2. Expand placement activities.
3. Provide full range of student health services.
4. Adopt liberalized interdistrict attendance procedures.

C. Minimum Standards:

1. Provide counseling as required by Education Code and Title 5.
2. Adopt standards of scholarship (grading scale, probation, dismissal) as required by Title 5; file copy with Chancellor's Office.
3. Adopt student health services plan; file copy with Chancellor's Office.

Agency Objectives and Activities:

1. Improve student support services, especially EOPS, handicapped programs, and counseling.

IV. PROGRAMS

A. Statewide Objectives:

1. Strive for or achieve program excellence.
2. Strive for or achieve comprehensive curriculum, including community services and remedial/developmental programs.

B. Guidelines:

1. Participate in Fund for Instructional Improvement.

C. Minimum Standards:

1. Adopt degrees and certificates procedures consistent with Title 5 requirements; file copy with Chancellor's Office.
2. Approve courses and programs in accordance with Education Code and Title 5 requirements.
3. Report on program changes and course and program approval in comprehensive plan.

Agency Objectives and Activities:

1. Press towards resolution of adult education delineation of function.
2. Encourage program quality and innovation.
3. Assume the leadership, and develop a strong position and plan for occupational education in the California Community Colleges.
4. Deemphasize or eliminate most specific course and program approval; emphasize comprehensive planning.
5. Establish criteria and standards for credit and noncredit courses.
6. Improve articulation between segments.

V. FACILITIES

A. Statewide Objectives:

1. Strive for or achieve effective and full use of facilities.
2. Strive for or achieve a "balanced campus."

B. Guidelines:

1. Expand outreach activities.
2. Adopt energy conservation measures.

C. Minimum Standards:

1. New colleges and educational centers are subject to Board of Governors approval in accordance with Title 5 regulations.

Agency Objectives and Activities:

1. Initiate Post-Proposition 13 capital outlay legislation.

VI. PLANNING AND USE OF RESOURCES

A. Statewide Objectives:

1. Improve local decisionmaking, especially through increased public participation in district planning.
2. Improve interdistrict planning and coordination of resources.

B. Guidelines:

1. Adopt liberalized interdistrict attendance procedures.

C. Minimum Standards:

1. Submit comprehensive plan and annual updates.

Agency Objectives and Activities:

1. Complete development of Information System.
2. Develop the California Occupational Information System (COIS).
3. Initiate legislation to remove unnecessary constraints on use and allocation of resources by districts.

VII. FINANCE

A. Statewide Objectives:

(Refer to Long-Term Finance Plan)

B. Guidelines:

(Refer to Long-Term Finance Plan)

C. Minimum Standards:

1. Certification of compliance with attendance accounting regulations.

Agency Objectives and Activities:

1. Continue to work for a long-term financing system for the community colleges--a system which will be stable, address inequities in funding, accommodate a variety of methods to deliver education, and which is accountable to the state for its investment.

2. Comprehensive review and redevelopment of current minimum standards for receipt of state aid.

Board of Governors Action No. 791255

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

INTEGRATING AND IMPLEMENTING POLICY DECISIONS

The Board of Governors adopted unanimously a motion endorsing the concept of the proposal and directing staff to bring the elements to the Board in as timely a manner as possible, using the suggested timetable and process as a guide. The Chancellor shall convene a special committee which shall be advisory to the Chancellor and which will play an integral part in the development and evaluation of the proposal.

Certified Adopted: December 7, 1979

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
STATEMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AND GOALS
(Adopted January 1976)

PHILOSOPHY

The Community Colleges of California are locally governed postsecondary educational institutions dedicated to the principle that society will benefit when all persons within it have the opportunity for life-long learning. To that end, the California Community Colleges are committed to providing career development, skills improvement and job retraining along with a full range of academic courses to broaden cultural, ethical, social and self-awareness. In addition, Community College districts may introduce and provide for avocational, civic and recreational pursuits, some of which will not be funded from state resources but from local resources and/or fees. What is known is made available to students, and they are encouraged to apply that knowledge to a deeper understanding of self to enhance the quality of relationships with others.

Based on this philosophy, Community College districts offer a wide variety of quality educational services in local colleges, off-campus centers and outreach programs. Each college is an accredited degree and certificate-granting institution, providing a comprehensive set of services, including (a) general or liberal education, (b) guidance in selecting careers and the education appropriate for these careers or other lifelong objectives, (c) supportive services for the development and well-being of students, and (d) a wide variety of intellectual and cultural programs for individuals in the community.

The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges provides statewide leadership and direction for local districts and colleges to assure their continued development as an integral element in the structure of postsecondary education in California. This leadership is accomplished by articulating the plans and needs of districts to regional, state, and federal agencies and through planning, coordination and administration of statewide policy, while maintaining and continuing to the maximum degree permissible local autonomy and control in the administration of the Community Colleges.

GOALS

In keeping with this philosophy, the Board of Governors endorses and encourages achievement of the following statewide goals for California Community Colleges.

- Equal opportunity for access to quality Community College education for all eligible individuals in California irrespective of age, sex, race or ancestry; economic, cultural or physical condition; previous educational experience; or geographic location.

- Preservation of academic freedom to maintain the integrity of instruction by thorough exploration of all ideas related to the topic under discussion.

- Fostering of staff excellence.

- Effective use of human and physical resources.

- Extensive use of Community resources to augment the traditional campus or college center, expanding off-campus outreach instructional facilities to meet the varying needs, interests and capacities of individuals.

- Diversity of programs, instructional methods, and services to meet the needs of society and the preferences of individuals for education as needs and preferences exist and change throughout California.

- Effective and equitable distribution of state funds among districts.

- Responsible evaluation through accreditation, self-appraisal, and other appropriate and locally determined measures of accountability.

- Policies that will encourage innovative and creative developments, based on anticipation of the future, in the provision of college services and use of community resources.

- Effective cooperation and planning among all educational institutions and other organizations to secure accessible education for all in an efficient manner.

- Timely consultation with all concerned segments of California Community Colleges so that the plans and the needs of the colleges are accurately identified and articulated to state and federal-level agencies and so that state policies are effectively communicated to local districts and colleges.

POLICY ON

PHILOSOPHY, GOALS, AND PRIORITIES

BOARD PROPOSALS

General Philosophy

The Long-Term Community College Finance Plan is designed to preserve the community colleges as a major and valuable resource for the people of the State of California. The Plan seeks seeks cost-related funding techniques which will: assure future stability; engender effective delivery of educational services required in local communities; and provide incentives toward statewide educational goals. Districts should be afforded flexibility in using their resources, and accountability procedures should emphasize long-term planning and results.

Mission, Goals and Priorities

- *Maintain the fundamental mission and goals of California Community Colleges:*
  - *postsecondary, less-than-baccalaureate, devoted to the life-long learning of California adults*
  - *comprehensive, including general, transfer, occupational, developmental and community education*
  - *strongly community-oriented*
- *Continue policy of open admissions for California residents.*
- *Identify and make explicit statewide educational interests which must be reflected in the districts' planning and accountability process.*
- *Establish community services as one of the statewide objectives to be treated in the proposed planning and accountability process.*

(From Board of Governors' Long-Term Finance Plan, adopted April 1979)

- *Within the framework of statewide educational interests, insure that districts have the flexibility to plan and to allocate resources in response to local needs.*

- *Provide districts with the maximum flexibility feasible for planning and managing their facilities, consistent with statewide interests.*

- *Set capital outlay priorities consistent with legislative intent, Board planning objectives, and district master plans according to the kind, purpose and need for facilities.*

- *Support the concept of a "balanced college" that provides facilities which are consistent with the accepted role of the college in its community. These facilities may include space for library, learning resources center, gymnasium; performing arts, outdoor physical education and acquatic facilities, space for administration; and instructional space related to enrollment needs.*

MISSION

Many proposed changes in college mission were considered by the Board in its study. Most changes were deemed inappropriate and there is no consensus on any fundamental change. A group of community college experts, convened from across the nation, also agreed on the need to maintain the comprehensisve mission of California's community colleges and their strong community orientation. (See summary of this seminar in Appendix B.)

The primary policy of Proposition 13 was to reduce the reliance of local government on a tax tied to the assessed valuation of real property. For several years in California, property values had increased at rates far exceeding the growth in personal income, needed governmental expenditures, and most other indices of economic activity. A second, perhaps indirect message, as interpreted by most public officials, was to economize and make more efficient governmental services. There was no mandate to decrease services or to eliminate certain individuals from eligibility for services.

Proposition 13 carried no specific mandate to change the basic purposes of California Community Colleges, which are quite similar to those of other community colleges nationwide. (See survey of other states in Appendix C.)

GOALS

Long-term finance reforms were evaluated for their impact on the Board of Governors' eleven goals, adopted in its first five-year plan.

Board goals most important for finance proposals are:

- equal opportunity for access
- diversity of programs, methods, and services
- effective and equitable distribution of funds
- effective use of human and physical resources
    - fostering of staff excellence
- policies that encourage innovative and creative developments

Other Board goals include:

- preservation of academic freedom
- extensive use of community resources
- responsible evaluation
- effective inter-institutional cooperation and planning
- timely consultation with all concerned segments

PRIORITIES

Present and future restrictions on taxes, possible expenditure limitations, and likely economic conditions suggest a new fiscal direction for community colleges. Under current law, public revenues do not appear sufficient over the next decade to provide the same level of support community colleges have experienced over the past three decades.

While the fundamental mission may remain unchanged, program priorities will have to change. In fact, there is evidence that college priorities are changing already. Cutbacks and budget reallocations were significant last year, particularly in noncredit instruction and community services. To a large extent, changes were mandated by state law. Half of the districts reported difficulty meeting one or another of these specific mandates.

Local Flexibility

Community colleges need greater flexibility if they are to continue to be community-oriented, become more cost-effective (as they must with scarce funding), and set priorities effectively. This includes flexibility to allocate funds among competing local uses and to plan and manage college operations. This greater flexibility can be accomplished in part by removing many existing legal constraints on the use of college resources together with a major change in college accountability from emphasis on short-term efforts to emphasis on long-term planning and results.

Statewide Priorities

In addition to reviewing local priorities, the Board of Governors should adopt procedures for identifying and proposing explicit statewide priorities.

Besides existing priorities on traditional college functions and certain, categorically funded clientele:

- educationally and economically disadvantaged
- handicapped
- occupationally-oriented

other specific priorities such as

- developmental (basic skills) education
- counseling, career guidance, and job placement
- career retraining
- instructional improvement (faculty, curriculum, and teaching methods development; academic standards; etc.)
- student retention
- administrative improvement
- staff development
- affirmative action

could be identified and addressed in relation to funding.

The Board of Governors could establish these priorities by adopting a number of explicit statewide objectives. Districts would be expected to reconcile their efforts with these objectives in a comprehensive plan submitted each year to the Chancellor's Office.

The community college capital outlay program should provide districts with the maximum flexibility feasible for planning and managing their facilities. Consistent with this concept, statewide project priorities must be explicit and should recognize the increasing importance of remodeling, alterations, and major maintenance in contrast to the decreasing importance of new construction. Capital outlay plans would form an integral part of annual comprehensive plans and updates submitted by districts to the Chancellor's Office under the Board's proposed planning and accountability procedure (see Section VI).

The Board of Governors should support, in principle, the concept of a "balanced college," that provides facilities which are consistent with the accepted role of the college in its community. These facilities may include space for library, learning resources center, gymnasium, performing arts, outdoor physical education and aquatic facilities, space for administration, and instructional space related to enrollment needs.

Under this concept proposals for public funding of facilities include evidence that the facility need is consistent with the state approved role of the college with respect to its operational and educational master plan, that there is specific justification for the proposal, and that other projects and sources of funds are considered by the district.

POLICY ON

ACCOUNTABILITY

BOARD PROPOSAL

- *Institute a planning and evaluation process that will*

  - *recognize that local boards are accountable to their local communities as well as to agencies designated by the Legislature and must demonstrate how they meet their community needs and respond to state educational interests;*

  - *provide a reporting technique which permits local districts to anticipate rather than react to emerging educational needs;*

  - *tie budget planning more effectively to staff hiring and layoffs through statutory funding and a planning/accountability process;*

  - *provide a vehicle for state-level budget decisions on the allocation of resources among higher education segments.*

- *Incorporate statewide educational interests into district plans through the adoption by the Board of Governors of measurable statewide objectives prior to district plan development.*

- *Require each district to submit a plan with annual updates each fall in order to be eligible for state funding. State-level plan review during the fall is accomplished by a Chancellor's Office staff/field review team. Review incorporates components of the plan which relate to state-level objectives (eliminating specific course review and limiting specific program review to high cost and/or limited need curricula).*

(From Board of Governors' Long-Term Finance Plan, adopted April 1979)

- *Require each district to describe in the plan all program changes. Those program changes requiring increased funding in a district's base budget will be proposed for inclusion in the Governor's Budget (and, therefore, undergo the budget review process) whereas funding for inflation and workload changes in base budgets will be specified by formula in statute.*

- *Include in plans the following content:*

  - *prioritized district and college objectives, including reconciliation with state objectives,*
  - *strategies and budgets for attainment of each objective,*
  - *evaluation criteria for each objective,*
  - *evaluation of achievement of prior years' objectives, and*
  - *evidence of participation in planning by college representatives and district constituents.*

- *Reconcile district/state differences through a positive consultative process, involving both the review team and district personnel. Reconciliation concerns the plan content as it relates to state objectives and the review of past year's practices relative to past year's plan.*

  The consultative process would involve the following steps:

  - *notify district of problem,*
  - *reconcile differences by relating state and local objectives or by altering the district's plans and practices,*
  - *determine appropriate corrective actions through combined state and local efforts,*
  - *review efforts and results of corrective measures at set points, and*
  - *consult with local board of trustees about problem.*

  Where differences are not reconciled or corrective measures are unsuccessful, districts will not be eligible for increased funding for program changes through the budget process.

- *Minimize the impact of the accountability process on state and local resources by:*

  - *making maximum use of existing data and, where possible, eliminating current reporting requirements,*
  - *using staff time available under the Flexible Calendar recommendation to balance the increased workload necessary to prepare the accountability/planning document,*
  - *using a combined Chancellor's Office/field staff review team,*
  - *providing assistance to districts in their planning through workshops and the development of planning tools, and*
  - *coordinating the proposed planning process with the voluntary accreditation process in order to avoid imposing a duplicate burden on districts.*

- *Change relevant Education Code provisions with implementation of the accountability process:*

  - *incorporate <u>essential</u> Education Code provisions (such as those related to master planning) into the accountability process;*
  - *provide, in the accountability process, for certification of compliance and potential audit by the Chancellor's Office with regards to <u>important</u> Education Code provisions (such as credentialled staff provisions, California residence, admissions);*
  - *eliminate <u>unnecessary</u> Education Code provisions (such as specific course approval, separate approval of summer sessions).*

The recommended planning and accountability process would combine existing local efforts into a state accountability system by making maximum use of existing data sources. The process meets existing state concerns for accountability, while maintaining local decisionmaking and thereby avoiding the need for alternatives such as budget review. Finally, the process changes current reporting requirements to a framework that provides a useful planning document to local districts and satisfies compliance requirements as a secondary effect.

PROPOSED PROCESS

The process begins with adoption by the Board of Governors of clearly delineated statewide objectives in December.

Districts begin plan development in January by reviewing master plan questions, state objectives, existing data, current local objectives, and current local operations. This is performed by college representatives and local constituents such as students, faculty, administrators, trustees and community advisory boards. Districts then develop a list of objectives to address specific problems facing the district, efforts which the district plans to maintain, and state objectives. Districts need not address all master plan questions. The questions are a framework for isolating relevant district objectives. However, districts are responsible for the entire list and are "auditable" in terms of demonstrating why certain areas were not included in the plan.

Districts refine objectives in the spring by developing a priority order and determining the strategy, budget, and evaluation criteria for each objective. New legislative priorities may be added in June. Finally, an evaluation of the previous year's plan needs to be included in the plan. Plans are completed and adopted by the local board of trustees in September after suitable public discussion.

Each district submits a finished plan to the Chancellor's Office in October. Between that time and the following March, each plan will have been reviewed and reconciled, if necessary, under the auspices of a staff/field review team. The reconciliation process specifically addresses differences between district objectives and state objectives, and prior year's practices relative to the prior year's plan. Plan implementation occurs when the reconciliation process is completed.

Based on submitted data and plan documents, the Chancellor's Office prepares a summary report for other state agencies and the Legislature, extracting program changes that require additional funding (to proceed through budget review), reviewing district practices and problems, and determining new state objectives where appropriate.

Accountability

The state currently requires extensive, but fragmented, data submittals by each district. Most of these submittals are interrelated, but there is little required analysis of the data elements or the relationship between elements. While educational master plans exist in some districts, there is no assurance that all colleges are planning adequately. The proposal requires all districts to develop their accountability document through a master planning system and, thus provides the state with necessary data and assurance of local planning.

All forms of accountability are important, including those dealing with college resources, activities and outcomes. Adequate planning must address all these concerns. While some form of local accountability exists, there is no systematic accountability process throughout the state. Any process which dilutes local accountability violates one of accountability's intended purposes. The proposal not only maintains but strengthens local accountability by providing the required structure and broad constituent participation.

External agencies need evidence that colleges are concerned with accountability and are planning adequately. This concern by external agencies combined with the absence of a systematic statewide accountability system has resulted in a number of alternative long-term finance proposals by other agencies. The process recommended by staff assures the state that districts are making adequate efforts to accomplish state objectives, while avoiding the unnecessary and disruptive centralization of alternative proposals.

Local and State Use

The proposed process not only satisfies accountability concerns, but also addresses two other needs. First, the process changes reporting requirements from acts of compliance to useful local decisionmaking processes. While the state cannot mandate useful local decisionmaking and districts may perceive the proposal solely as an act of compliance, the intent is to provide a framework that is useful to districts and satisfies compliance requirements as a by-product. Second, the process should meet the concerns

of other state agencies. The annual plan will detail all program changes anticipated by the district. These program changes which require increased funding will be amalgamated and proceed through a budget review process. Therefore, the state can identify, review, and control all new funding through the program change component of the accountability process. The proposed process provides a vehicle for identifying common problems and the need for new state objectives.

The process requires districts to undertake a comprehensive planning process oriented to local problems and variations as well as state objectives. Therefore, while the master plan questions appear lengthy, districts will only respond in the areas related to their circumstances. The product is then a working document for local districts.

Reconciliation

In cases where district objectives or practices are at variance with statewide objectives, a series of positive steps are taken to correct the problem. Only after these cooperative actions, involving the state and local district, are taken and prove unsuccessful would sanctions be imposed. The first sanction involves public consultation with the district board. If all efforts prove unsuccessful, the district would become ineligible for any program change funding increases. This would have the impact of denying a district funding for a significant new program while, at the same time, existing programs are deficient. Statutory funding for workload and inflation would continue. Consequently, students would not be penalized by a loss of existing district funds. It is expected that most district plans will be consistent with statewide objectives and that the reconciliation process would be necessary in a limited number of cases -- a "management by exception" process.

Basic Objectives

The process proposed seeks to provide the requisite accountability without resorting to heavy use of categorical funding or state-level budget review of district budgets. While districts require budget flexibility to be effective, a return to pre-Proposition 13 methods is neither feasible nor desirable. Accountability should be shared between state and local authorities.

The proposed process relies on relatively stable statutory funding of district workload and inflation together with budget review of added funding needed for district program changes. These funding changes, together with the planned activities and performance of colleges generally, can be reviewed during budget act development in the context of public higher eudcation, education generally, or the entire California public sector.

Fixed Budget Act Appropriation

A fixed, aggregate appropriation set at the state level for allocation among districts is inequitable and sets a major policy precedent. If one or several districts require increased funding during the course of a fiscal year, other districts lose funds. The budget of one district should be a function of its own needs, not a function also of the needs of 69 other districts whose circumstances may be totally unrelated.

More important, the aggregate budget or fixed appropriation may lead to the need for statewide control of community college enrollments and, therefore, a departure from the existing policy of open admissions. State control of college enrollments would deny access and negate a fundamental philosophy of California Community Colleges: that of equal educational opportunity.

Timing

Use of the budget act to determine all community college expenditures is too uncertain and occurs too late for districts to effectively bargain, meet certain other requirements such as staff layoff notices, and to plan budgets generally. Adoption of the budget act, typically in June of each year, occurs three months after March 15th when districts must notify full-time certificated faculty they are not to be rehired for the budget year. The layoff notification date is appropriate. Therefore, the solution is to provide districts with a relatively certain picture of their budget year revenues prior to the notification date. Use of the budget act prevents this.

Scope of Review

Determining community college district needs for workload changes and inflation, by statutory formulas, provides a broader policy review of major fiscal changes than does the annual budget process. The limited context of just public higher education in some budget subcommittees seems too narrow to encompass the variety of concerns of other agencies and institutions that relate to community college education.

Uniqueness

The fiscal process should recognize differences in governance and mission between community colleges and the University of California (UC) and California State University and Colleges (CSUC), on the one hand, and public elementary and secondary schools (K-12) on the other hand. In this regard, comprehensive community colleges are a unique postsecondary educational

District boards need budget flexibility if they are to continue to be community-oriented, become more cost-effective (as they must with scarce funding), and set priorities effectively. This includes flexibility to allocate funds among competing local uses and to plan and manage college operations. This can be accomplished in part by removing many existing legal constraints on the use of college resources together with a major change in college accountability from emphasis on short-term efforts to emphasis on long-term planning and results.

ALTERNATIVES

A number of alternative long-term fiscal support techniques for community colleges have been proposed. These alternatives range all the way from line item budget review of seventy district budgets at the state level to relatively inflexible statutory formulas of the sort that existed prior to Proposition 13.

The major differences among alternative proposals concern whether fiscal policy is contained in statute or in the annual budget act, the character of funding formulas, the level of district budget detail examined at the state level, and in general, the means by which districts are accountable to state and local taxpayers.

Budget Act Negotiation

Negotiating seventy community college district budgets at the state level in a fashion like CSUC, for example, would be costly, preclude local flexibility, and narrow policy considerations to just those that relate to highly detailed fiscal proposals. No other large states use negotiated budgets. Virginia, with twenty-three college budgets and less than 150,000 students, is the largest state to use a negotiated budget technique and even they must resort to a number of standard formulas.

Standard Budget Act Formulas

Another alternative involves the review and determination, during the annual budget process, of certain standard formulas for community college funding. Use of standard formulas such as statewide salary schedules (and, presumably, statewide collective bargaining), student: faculty: administrator ratios, and minimum class size restrictions does not provide the flexibility needed by local boards if they are to set priorities based upon the unique and differing educational needs in their communities. Such formulas are much too uniform and arbitrary to accommodate the multitude of situations and communities represented in 70 districts, 106 colleges, and nearly 3,000 outreach centers throughout California.

institution encompassing more than just lower division transfer instruction, the area of overlap with UC and CSUC. Community colleges also offer occupational, developmental, general, and community education. Community colleges are managed by locally-elected boards in a fashion similar to K-12. This is not the case for either UC or CSUC, all of whose campuses are responsible to a central statewide board.

AGENCY OBJECTIVES AND ASSIGNMENT OF PRIORITIES TO FUNCTIONS (Adopted July, 1979)

Background

Staffing for the Chancellor's Office has not kept pace with the responsibilities the Legislature has assigned the agency to carry out. A few statistics amply establish the workload problem we face.

During the period of 1970 to 1975, staff grew from 80 to 123. Since 1975, staffing for the agency increased to a high of 141 in 1977-78, and has currently fallen to 125. Since 1975, however, the Legislature has assigned some 80 additional responsibilities to the agency, thereby increasing the number of mandates we are charged with carrying out from 520 to over 600. Thus, while staffing for the agency is about the same as it was in 1975, we are charged with carrying out some 80 additional functions.

Recognizing this pattern, we have begun to take steps to address the problem. The first step was to undertake a comprehensive review of all Education Code provisions which establish powers or duties for the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office. In an effort to streamline and update the statewide governance structure, recommendations were made regarding the repeal or amendment of some 270 of the 600 provisions addressing the agency's functions. The Board, as you know, has approved these recommendations, and they are now contained in a bill authored by Assemblyman Vasconcellos (AB 1549).

Many of the mandates dealt with in this bill are outdated provisions or provisions which had been mistakenly made applicable to the community colleges when the Education Code was reorganized during 1975-77. In either case, the agency has, for the most part, never taken steps to comply with these provisions. As such, repealing or amending them will only partially reduce the workload of the agency.

A second step to address the workload problem has been to seek increased staff. The passage of Proposition 13 has severely limited this strategy. In subsequent years, however, major efforts are planned in this area.

The third step, the one under discussion, is to attempt to prioritize the functions the agency is charged with carrying out, and to redirect staff and resources, to the extent possible, to insure that the first priority functions are addressed. In order to assign priorities, however, it is first necessary to identify agency objectives for the next two fiscal years and understand our current state of compliance with these functions.

Objectives for 1979-80 and 1980-81

Before addressing the specific objectives for the next two fiscal years, it is important to understand the current overall character of the agency. Overall, the present role and function of the Board and Chancellor's Office is one which is highly regulatory in nature. Of the some 600 provisions which establish mandates for the agency, fewer than 10 relate to functions which are of a leadership/ service type. Predominantly we tend to be charged with carrying out many highly specific and diverse

duties, which we tend to regulate in a highly specific and diverse manner. Preoccupation with these regulatory responsiblities has, in my opinion, been at the expense of the leadership and service functions the agency needs to be performing. We're often so embroiled in compliance functions that we can't be forward looking. All too often problems fall upon the agency that could have been prevented if we had the time and resources to plan, lead and serve. There needs to be a better balance between the leadership/service function and the regulatory function.

As to agency objectives for the next two fiscal years, I believe we should continue to meet the unmet goals we have earlier established (see appendix) as well as the following:

1. Continue to work for and/or effectuate a long-term financing system for the community colleges, a system which will be stable, address inequities in funding, accommodate a variety of methods to deliver education, and be accountable to the state for its investment. Capital outlay funding must also be addressed so that a source of support is secured, and so that state priorities for funding are redefined.

2. Continue to work for a system of governance and operation which is streamlined, efficient and accountable. Unnecessary constraints on the use and allocation of resources by local boards should be eliminated. Statutes which address mandated functions of local governing boards and districts should be comprehensively reviewed in a manner similar to the recent review of our functions.

3. Complete development of the Information System for community colleges and insure its compatibility with the California Occupational Information System (COIS) and the necessary elements of the federal Vocational Education Data System (VEDS). Accurate and timely data on students, courses and programs, facilities, staff, and finance is more important than ever now that we must defend an increasingly larger share of support from the state.

4. Continue efforts to expand access to the community colleges. Full funding, in both services and grants, should be achieved for the vital EOPS program. The funding mechanism for programs and services for the handicapped should be reworked so that funding meets needs. Bilingual/bicultural programs need further development so as to support non-English speaking students and enhance their success in a culturally different environment. Interdistrict attendance restrictions need to be scrutinized with an eye towards elimination.

5. Press towards resolution of adult education delineation of function issues and the community colleges' future role in lifelong learning.

6. Devote more staff time and resources to the leadership and service functions of this agency by continuing to perform only the necessary and important regulatory functions. Representing the districts before state and national legislative and executive agencies has become increasingly important, as has conducting workshops to keep the field apprised of recent legal changes, especially in the area of finance. Leadership will be especially important in maintaining local autonomy and control for the community colleges.

7. Encourage quality and innovation within the system. Preoccupation with finance problems has kept us from addressing such issues as improved instructor training, innovative delivery techniques, and improved student support services. Transferability of our community college courses to four-year institutions is also a subject that needs special attention.

8. Assume the leadership and develop a strong position and plan for Occupational Education in California Community Colleges. Coordinate the development and execution of the California Community Colleges portion of the State Plan for Vocational Education.

Functions of the Agency

The specific functions of and mandates for the agency are contained in some 600 plus statutory provisions, mostly located in the Education Code. Rather than deal with each of the 600 plus mandates separately,* which would be unworkable, they have been grouped according to function under two broad categories: regulatory/compliance functions, and leadership/service functions. Some 34 regulatory/compliance functions, and 9 leadership/compliance functions have been separately identified.

Functions to be designated as first priority should be of such importance that additional staff should be sought through the budget, or that staff and resources of the agency should be redirected to perform them if they can't be adequately performed with existing staff assignments. Second priority functions are important, but should be performed within existing staffing patterns for the function.

I. REGULATORY/COMPLIANCE FUNCTIONS

A. Administration of state and federal aid (EC 12200-12220, 12302, 14000-14070, 14200-14270, 67003, 71072, 84000-85440). Generally speaking, the Board and Chancellor's Office is required to administer state support programs, both operational and capital outlay, and those federally supported programs for which the Board has responsibility pursuant to state or federal law. Board responsibilities with respect to capital outlay funds are treated elsewhere. This section focuses only on operational support.

The Fiscal Services Unit, with a professional staff of six, has the responsibility for carrying out most of the functions addressed in this section. Major functions of the administration of state and federal aid include:

1. Attendance accounting procedures (EC 76300, 76310, 76320, 84500-84532). The Board is charged with establishing attendance accounting standards and procedures and administering such standards and procedures. Standards for existing law are sufficiently in place, but any long-term finance reform which departs from the use of the average daily attendance concept

*For a complete analysis of all mandates addressed to the Board and Chancellor's Office, see Education Code Mandates of the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office Comments on Compliance and Recommendations for Change, March 1979.

will necessitate a review and modification of these standards and procedures. Staff is currently reviewing these provisions in connection with the marginal cost concept contained in the Board's long-term plan.

This function is of second priority and will not require a great deal of attention during the coming year.

2. Minimum standards for receipt of state aid (EC 71025, 66700, 74100, 71066, 71068, 78405; and Title 5, 51000-51826, and 53000-53004). The Board, in numerous instances, is charged with adopting rules and regulations establishing minimum standards for receipt of state aid. The Board has adopted, on a piecemeal basis, minimum standards regarding instructional programs, faculty, standards of scholarship, facilities, counseling services, degrees and certificates, minimum class size, new colleges and educational centers, open courses, and affirmative action. These minimum standards have never been comprehensively reviewed by the Board. Such a review will probably be necessary in connection with the accountability portion of the Board's long-term finance proposal.

   This function is of first priority. A comprehensive, up-to-date set of minimum standards needs to be developed by the Board.

3. Investigation for compliance with minimum standards (EC 71026). The Chancellor's Office is required to annually investigate each community college to determine compliance with minimum standards. Currently this mandate is not being fulfilled. The Board's role/function legislation would change the requirement of annual investigation to periodic investigation.

   During the coming year we will not be able to fulfill this responsibility. This mandate, however, should be incorporated into the accountability portion of the Board's long-term finance plan. Addition of necessary staff to perform such investigations should also be incorporated into the proposal.

   This function is of first priority, although it will not be possible to meet without additional staff.

4. Audits (EC 84040-84040.6). The Board has various responsibilities with respect to audits of community college districts. It must assist the Department of Finance in developing audit procedures; and on June 30, 1979, it must report to the Legislature on (1) the number and nature of audit exceptions and estimated amount of funds involved in such exceptions, (2) a list of districts which failed to file their audits, and (3) the actions taken to eliminate audit exceptions.

These mandates, which arise from 1977 legislation, will not be fulfilled unless staffing is provided as requested in the 1979-80 budget. Even if staffing is provided, we will still be unable to report by the June 30, 1979, deadline. In the future it may be appropriate for the Chancellor's Office to take a more active role in the fiscal audit function, especially in connection with the long-term finance plan (see also item 2 on page 5, as well as item 2 on page 7).

This function is of secondpriority. Existing staff should not be redirected to comply within the given time frame. In the future, it may be appropriate for the Chancellor's Office to take more of an active role in the audit function, especially in connection with the long-term plan.

5. Budget and accounting procedures (EC 71073, 84004, 84030, 85021-85024). The Board is required to establish a uniform system of budgeting and accounting for districts, as well as a Budgeting and Accounting Manual. We have sufficiently met these mandates, except with respect to a uniform system of accounting for district reserves.

   This function is of second priority and will not require much attention during the coming year; except that accounting for district reserves is a first priority item.

6. Withholding apportionment (EC 84327, 84330, 84362, 84370, 84373, 84703). The Board is required to withhold apportionment in such instances as district non-compliance with the 50% law, the 175-day rule, and failure to comply with Board-established minimum standards. We monitor compliance with the 50% law, but not minimum standards. We rely on Department of Finance audits as to the 175-day rule.

   This function is of second priority. We should continue our present practices during the coming year.

7. Warrants (EC 85241-85266). The Education Code authorizes districts to issue their own warrants (paychecks) upon application to and review by the Board of Governors. Legislation in 1976 provided a similar authorization, except that review and approval is the responsibility of county superintendents.

   Although unnecessary, the state-level application and approval procedure is still on the books. We are seeking its repeal in the role/function legislation. Until such repeal we should direct districts to apply to their county superintendents instead of us.

   This function is of second priority.

8. Interdistrict attendance (EC 71075, 78030). The Board is required to implement existing interdistrict attendance law by establishing procedures governing interdistrict attendance agreements and restrictions on attendance between districts. We have not met this mandate, except that modifications of existing interdistrict attendance law are being considered in the Board's long-term plan.

   Implementing these provisions is a function of second priority, although reform of interdistrict attendance is a first priority. Efforts should continue to focus on modifying the law to provide free flow rather than implementing what may be unnecessary provisions of law. These efforts should be undertaken in connection with the Board's leadership and direction function.

B. Educational Programs. The Board has numerous responsibilities with respect to the educational programs being offered at community colleges. The Program Evaluation and Approval Unit, with a professional staff of eleven, has the responsibility for performing most of the functions discussed in this section. Major functions include the following:

1. Course and program approval (EC 78200, 78203, 78401, 78412, 78440; and Title 5, 55000-55360). The Board must review and approve each educational program, or each course which is not a part of an approved program, before such course or program may be offered at a community college. Each year the Program Evaluation and Approval Unit, applying Title 5 criteria, reviews the following numbers of programs and courses:

   1. Credit programs: 100-175
   2. Credit courses: 275-600
   3. Noncredit courses: 10,000-15,000

   Generally speaking, between 20-30% of the credit programs and courses submitted are not approved. Almost all noncredit courses are approved.

   Course and program approval should be a second priority function during the coming year. This activity should be integrated into the master plan process (see below), and staff is currently pursuing this option in developing the accountability portion of the Board's long-term plan. Districts would apply the Board's Title 5 criteria and approve their own courses and programs; the Chancellor's Office would review, approve and monitor this activity in connection with the master plan process.

2. Master plan review and approval (EC 71028; Title 5, 55400-55405). The Board is required to review and approve academic master plans and master plans for facilities for each community college district. Annual updates are required to be submitted to the Board. We are currently complying with this function, although our review of such plans has been cursory.

The master plan process should be a first priority function during the coming year. It should be adapted so as to incorporate course and program approval. In addition, it can serve as the authority and basis for the "comprehensive plan" aspect of the accountability portion of the Board's long-term finance plan.

3. Criteria and standards for credit and noncredit courses (EC 71027, 71067, 78201.5; and Title 5, 51103, 55000-55002). The Board is required to establish criteria and standards for credit and noncredit classes. These standards have been established.

   As a result of legislation enacted during the past few years (SB 154 -- the "bail-out" measure which generally prohibits state aid for noncredit classes; AB 459 -- 1977 legislation which defined the terms "credit" and "noncredit;" and AB 1821 -- 1975 legislation which created RAVEC's), the definition of "credit" has become very important. A review and potential redefinition of the Board's existing standards and criteria is thus also very important. This should be a first priority function for the coming year.

4. Monitor and review (EC 71095). The Chancellor's Office is, on a periodic basis, required to monitor and review approved courses and programs for compliance with applicable laws. We have not fulfilled this mandate, which became effective July 1, 1977.

   This function should be of second priority during the coming year. A minimal monitor and review process should be implemented as soon as possible. This process should be compatible with the accountabiltiy portion of the Board's long-term plan.

5. Academic year/calendar (EC 72252, 78008, 84907, 84890-84897). The Board has responsibilities with respect to approving and establishing census week procedures for quarter systems, trisemesters, summer sessions and intersessions. The Board is also charged with establishing and evaluating the flexible calendar pilot project.

   During the coming year this function should be of second priority. Approval of the academic calendar should be incorporated into the master plan process. Provisions requiring separate approval of summer sessions, trisemesters or intersessions should be repealed; and we have sought such repeal in the role/function legislation. Any further recommendations coming out of the flexible calendar pilot project should be incorporated into the long-term finance legislation.

6. Adult education (EC 8512, 8500-8537, 78400-78465; Title 5, 58000-58253). The Board has responsibilities with respect to establishing standards for and approving adult education courses and programs. During the coming year we should continue to meet these requirements, but should review and update existing standards in Title 5 (sections 58000-58253), and should attempt to secure a more clear-cut delineation of function as to the responsibilities of K-12 and community colleges. Course and program approval for adult education offerings should be incorporated into the master plan approval process.

   This function should be of first priority during the coming year. The future role of the community colleges with respect to lifelong learning needs to be more clearly defined. State funding for adult education (non credit) will be especially critical during the coming year.

7. Regional Adult and Vocational Education Councils -- RAVEC's (EC 8020-8035). RAVEC's were created as review, planning and coordination bodies to prevent unnecessary duplication of noncredit adult and vocational education courses and programs. Chancellor's Office staff assisted these local bodies in performing these functions. No funding was provided for RAVEC's during the current fiscal year.

   All Board and Chancellor's Office responsibilities with respect to RAVEC's should be a second priority pending legislative resolution of the future funding and role of RAVEC's.

8. California Occupational Information System -- COIS (EC 8123-8133). Effective January 1, 1979, the Chancellor's Office has the responsibility to participate on a statewide coordinating committee (COICC); to produce information concerning the number of students enrolled, by job category, in the community colleges; to seek federal funds; and to report to the Legislature.

   This function is of first priority. Information for and from COIS should be made compatible with the Chancellor's Office Information System.

9. Vocational education contracts (EC 8090-8093). The Board and Chancellor have responsibilities for adopting regulations as well as reviewing and approving vocational offerings delivered by districts through private contractors.

   This function should be of second priority during the coming year. The Board's regulations should be amended so as to address concerns of the Auditor General contained in his recent investigation of such contracting. The Board has already endorsed legislation which would address the high profitability of these contracts.

10. Fund for Instructional Improvement (EC 84382-84387; Title 5, 56650-56682). The Board has responsibilities for adopting regulations and administering this program, which provides grants and loans to community college districts for purposes of instructional improvement. The regulations have been adopted and we are otherwise performing this function, except that the loan portion of the fund is not being utilized.

    This function is of second priority. We should continue to fulfill these responsibilities during the coming year, as well as pursue legislation to redirect loan funds to some other use.

11. Vocational education, including apprenticeship (Vocational Education Act of 1973, Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Education Amendments of 1976). Federal law establishes numerous responsibilities for state agencies that administer federal vocational education funds. Primary responsibilities include planning, program approval, program evaluation and improvement, and administration of funding.

    This function is of first priority.

C. Student services. Major regulatory/compliance functions of the Board which relate to student services are performed primarily by the College Services Unit, which has a professional staff of eleven. Key functions are as follows:

1. Academic standards (EC 71066; Title 5, 51300-51319, and 51620-51626). The Board is required to establish minimum standards relating to graduation requirements and probation, as well as dismissal and readmission policies.

    This function should be of second priority during the next year. We have sufficiently complied with these mandates and no agency action is needed in the coming year, with the possible exception that these standards should be reviewed for appropriateness.

2. Extended Opportunity Programs and Services -- EOPS (EC 69640-69654; Title 5, 56200-56300).

    Existing law and regulations adopted by the Board provide for special programs, services and grants to be provided for low income disadvantaged students. The Board has adopted a policy to seek full funding for both the grants and services portions of this program.

    The Board and Chancellor's Office should continue to fulfill mandates relating to EOPS during the coming year. This should be a first priority function.

3. Handicapped student programs and services (EC 78014, 78440, 84850; Title 5, 56000-56088, and 56350-56360). The Board and Chancellor's Office are required to adopt regulations and administer direct excess cost funding (AB 77 -- Chapter 275, Statutes of 1976) for programs and services for handicapped students attending community colleges. We have complied with these mandates and the program has been very successful, except for the fact that the statutory funding mechanism (based on statewide ADA) has not produced sufficient funds for the program.

   This function should be of first priority during the coming year. In addition, a new funding mechanism for such programs should be developed and incorporated into the long-term finance proposal. The regulations should also be reviewed.

4. Real estate education scholarships (Title 5, 56600-56628). Existing law relating to the Department of Real Estate establishes a Real Estate Endowment Fund from which scholarships are awarded to students, and community college programs for real estate education are provided improvement grants. We are in compliance with law and have adopted appropriate regulations.

   This function is of second priority; we should continue to administer this program during the coming year.

5. Libraries (EC 18101, 18121-18122, 71039). The Board is required to adopt rules and regulations for libraries for community colleges; to do comparative studies of community colleges library conditions; and to consult with districts on the establishment and development of community college libraries.

   This function should be of second priority. We have never performed the above functions, and will probably not be able to perform them during the coming year.

6. Student affirmative action (ACR 151, Chapter 209, Statutes of 1974). ACR 151 requests the segments of public higher education to prepare a plan for addressing and overcoming, by 1980, ethnic, sexual, and economic underrepresentation in the makeup of student bodies of institutions of public higher education. The Board adopted a student affirmative action report, plan, and future funding request at its February, 1979 meeting.

   This function should be a first priority during the coming year.

D. Facilities planning. Major functions under this heading are generally performed by the Facilities Planning Unit, which has a professional staff of eight. Major functions which relate to facilities planning are as follows:

1. Administration of the Community College Construction Act of 1967 (EC 81800-81845; Title 5, 57000-57033). The Board is required to adopt regulations for administration of the Construction Act, and the Chancellor is required to administer it.

   We should continue, as a first priority, to perform this function during the coming year. The Board should address the issues of eligibility for state funding and priorities for state funding. Portions of the Construction Act, especially those related to funding, must be rewritten and incorporated into the long-term finance proposal.

2. California Environmental Quality Act--CEQA (Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et. seq.) The Public Resources Code and regulations adopted by the Resources Agency require the Chancellor's Office, as a "responsible agency" to review and consider certain environmental impact documents prior to approving capital outlay projects. This agency has not complied with these mandates in the past, and we do not have the staff to do so in the coming year.

   This function should be of second priority during the coming year.

3. Campus site selection (EC 71077, 81031, 81836). The Board is required to establish procedures regarding campus site selection and the Chancellor is required to advise districts on the acquisition of new sites. Such procedures are currently being developed by staff.

   This function should be of second priority during the coming year. Procedures for site selection should be adopted by the Board, and we should continue to advise districts on the acquisition of new sites. These activities should be carried out in cooperation with CPEC, so as to prevent duplication of effort.

E. Employees. Major functions which relate to employees are performed by the Credentials Unit, with a professional staff of three; the Legal Unit, with a professional staff of two; and the Affirmative Action Unit, with a professional staff of one. Major functions which relate to employees include:

1. Minimum standards (EC 71068;Title 5, 52000-52954). The Board is required to establish minimum standards for the employment of academic and administrative staff in the community colleges. Since credentialing regulations are generally considered to be minimum standards, the Board has met this mandate.

   The advent of collective bargaining has somewhat lessened the Board's role in this area, although the Board continues to have a strong interest in affirmative action. Affirmative action, as a function, is addressed on page 45, item 4.

   This function should be of second priority during the coming year.

2. Credentials (EC 87200-87347; Title 5, 52000-52854). The Board is required to adopt standards for the various types of community college credentials, and to revoke, deny and suspend credentials under specified circumstances. Over fifty pages of regulations have been adopted by the Board in compliance with these mandates. The Chancellor is required to administer these functions. We make determinations on approximately 30,000 credential applications per year.

   During the coming year we should, as a second priority, continue to administer the credentialing functions.

3. Unemployment insurance (EC 1330). The Chancellor is required to represent and exercise all rights of appeal on behalf of school employers concerning unemployment insurance. The Legal Unit currently performs this function, although additional staff may be needed in the future.

   We should, as a second priority, continue to comply with this mandate during the coming year.

4. Affirmative action (EC 87101-87106; Title 5, 53000-53004). The Board is required to adopt regulations regarding affirmative action employment programs, and the Chancellor is required to render assistance to districts in developing and implementing such programs, and to report to the Legislature. The Board has adopted the necessary regulations.

   This function should be a first priority during the coming year. It is important to prevent losses in affirmative action gains due to Proposition 13 cutbacks.

F. District organization (EC 71063, 74000, 74100). The Board is required to establish minimum standards for the formation of districts, to exercise general supervision over the formation and reorganization of districts, and to approve all organization and reorganization proposals. These standards have been adopted and we have, for the most part, performed them in the past.

   This function should be a second priority during the coming year.

II. LEADERSHIP/SERVICE FUNCTIONS

A. Leadership and direction (EC 71023). The Board is required to provide leadership and direction in the continuing development of community colleges. Its work is to be directed at maintaining and continuing, to the maximum degree permissible, local autonomy and control in the administration of the colleges.

   This function should be a first priority during the coming year. The Board should especially concentrate its leadership on bringing about long-term finance reform and a system of governance which is more streamlined, efficient, updated, and accountable.

B. Administrative and coordinative services (EC 71041). The Board is required to:

(1) Revise and update budget manuals, forms and guidelines.

(2) Cooperate with federal and state agencies in prescribing rules and regulations.

(3) Assess the needs and methods of collecting and disseminating financial information.

(4) Conduct workshops and conferences for the purpose of training community college district and county personnel.

(5) Provide consultant services to colleges and universities on courses of instruction relative to school budgets and accounting practices.

This function should be a first priority. During the coming year we should concentrate on (1), (2) and (3) above; we won't have the staffing to accomplish (4) and (5).

C. Workshops with governing boards (EC 71042). The Board is authorized (not required) to conduct, in conjunction with district governing boards, workshops on school finance, the Education Code, and other specified matters.

This function should be a second priority during the coming year. We have not conducted such workshops in the past, but should consider doing so in the future, especially with respect to any long-term finance bill that is successful.

D. Interdistrict, regional and statewide development (EC 71064). The Board is required to coordinate and encourage interdistrict, regional, and statewide development of community college programs and facilities.

This function should be of first priority during the coming year. While we have not fulfilled this leadership mandate in the past, we should attempt to do so during the coming year. Access and quality of programs would otherwise suffer.

E. Research, compilation and analysis of data (EC 71069). The Board is required to conduct necessary statewide research on community colleges and to provide appropriate information services, including, but not limited to, definitions for the purpose of uniform reporting, collection, compilation and analysis of data for effective planning and coordination, and dissemination of information. This function is performed primarily by the Analytical Studies Unit, which has a professional staff of seven.

We should as a first priority, continue to fulfill this function during the coming year; special attention should be devoted to making the Information System fully operative.

F. Excellence within sphere (EC 66013). Each segment of public higher education is required to strive for excellence in its sphere (as delineated in the Master Plan).

This should be a high priority function during the coming year. Although this mandate is somewhat vague, we should continue to work towards this goal by encouraging quality and innovation within the system. Special attention should be directed to improving instructor training, accommodating innovative delivery techniques, and improving student support services.

G. Facilitating articulation (EC 71070). The Board is required to facilitate articulation with other segments of higher education and with secondary education.

We should continue, as a high priority function, to fulfill this mandate during the coming year. Transferability of courses is a subject that needs special attention.

H. Representing community colleges (EC 71071). The Board is required to represent the community colleges before state and national legislative and executive agencies. This function is performed primarily by the Governmental and Public Affairs Unit, which has a professional staff of four.

We should continue, as a high priority function, to meet this mandate during the coming year. The Washington, D.C. office should be maintained. Representing community college interests before the State Legislature during the next few years is especially critical.

I. Financial aid and advice (EC 71078). The Board is required to plan for, and advise on, financial assistance and scholarship programs for community college students. We currently perform this function in a minimum way. This function should be a medium priority during the coming year. Attention needs to be devoted to apprising districts of new federal and state financial aid legislation, and to generally improving district financial aid administration.

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, for purposes of developing its 1980-81 budget, hereby assigns the following priorities to its statutory functions, as discussed on pages 11 - 23 of the following item:

I. First Priority Functions for Budget Purposes

- A comprehensive review and redevelopment of current minimum standards for receipt of state aid
- Investigation for compliance with minimum standards
- Master plan review and approval
- Criteria and standards for credit and noncredit courses
- Adult education delineation of function
- California Occupational Information System (COIS)
- Vocational education, including apprenticeship
- Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS)
- Handicapped student programs and services
- Student affirmative action
- Revision of the Community College Construction Act
- Affirmative action employment programs
- Leadership and direction
- Administrative and coordinative services
- Interdistrict, regional and statewide development of programs and facilities
- Research, compilation and analysis of data
- Excellence within sphere
- Facilitating articulation
- Representing community colleges before state and national legislative and executive agencies

II. Second Priority Functions for Budget Purposes

- Attendance accounting procedures
- Audits (fiscal)
- Budget and accounting procedures

- Withholding apportionment
- Course and program approval
- Monitor and review of approved courses and programs
- Vocational education contracts
- Fund for Instructional Improvement (AB 1173)
- Campus site selection
- Minimum standards for academic and administrative employees (generally)
- Credentials
- Unemployment insurance representation
- District organization
- Workshops with governing boards
- Financial aid and advice
- Approval of warrants
- Implementing existing interdistrict attendance restrictions
- Academic year/calendar approval
- Regional Adult and Vocational Education Councils (RAVEC's)
- Academic standards
- Real estate education scholarships
- Libraries
- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- Minimum standards for academic and administrative employees (credentialing regulations)

Be it further resolved that the Chancellor is authorized to redirect staff and resources of the agency to insure that first priority functions are addressed.

§ 66700. Community colleges as part of public school system; duties of State Board of Education

The public community colleges are secondary schools and shall continue to be a part of the public school system of this state. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall prescribe minimum standards for the formation and operation of public community colleges and exercise general supervision over public community colleges.

§ 69648. Rules and regulations

The board shall adopt rules and regulations necessary to implement the provisions of this article including rules and regulations which:

(a) Prescribe the procedure by which a district shall identify a student eligible for extended opportunity programs or services.

(b) Establish minimum standards for the establishment and conduct of extended opportunity programs and services.

(c) Require the submission of such reports by districts as will permit the evaluation of the program and services offered.

§ 71025. Adoption of minimum standard for receipt of state aid

The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall adopt rules and regulations fixing minimum standards entitling districts to receive state aid for the support of community colleges.

71026. The chancellor's office shall periodically, according to rules and regulations adopted by the board of governors, investigate each community college to determine whether it has met the standards prescribed pursuant to Section 71025. As part of such investigation, representatives of the chancellor's office may participate in the accreditation visits conducted by the regional accrediting agency, and one representative of the chancellor's office, who may be appointed by the chancellor, may serve as a member of the accrediting commission which accredits the public community colleges.

71027. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall establish criteria and standards for credit and noncredit classes.

§ 71028. Master plans

The board of governors shall review and approve academic master plans and master plans for facilities for each community college district. Such plans shall be submitted to the board of governors by the local governing board of each community college district. Master plans for facilities submitted pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 81800) of Part 49 of Division 7 of this title shall satisfy the requirements of this section in relation to master plans for facilities. Each district shall annually submit changes in its approved academic master plan for approval by the board of governors.

§ 71066. Minimum academic standards

The board of governors shall establish minimum standards to govern student academic standards relating to graduation requirements and probation, dismissal, and readmission policies.

§ 71068. Minimum employment standards

The board of governors shall establish minimum standards for the employment of academic and administrative staff in community colleges.

§ 74100. Minimum formation standards

The board of governors shall establish minimum standards for the formation of community college districts.

§ 84373. Limitation on apportionments to community colleges

No community college district shall receive any apportionment from the State School Fund on account of any community college which has failed for three consecutive years to comply with the standards prescribed by the board of governors for accredited community colleges.

PAGES 52 THROUGH 76 WERE DELETED DUE TO IRREPRODUCIBILITY. THEY CONTAINED TITLE 5 PROVISIONS RELATED TO MINIMUM STANDARDS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 26

AUG 1 1980